

ensure that our national treasures are protected for generations to come. It requires the Service to develop a master plan for the system which includes an inventory of existing resources and prioritizes which cultural, natural, and historical resources should be added to the system. It streamlines the process of designating new units by requiring the Service to annually provide the Congress with a list of areas to be studied and those areas of sufficient national significance to warrant inclusion in the system. Finally, our bill requires Congress to authorize studies and designate new park units to ensure that this body retains final authority to determine the scope of the system.

Our bill will also reform out-dated parks concession policy. The current framework was put in place when our parks were remote, visitorship was low and companies had to be enticed to offer visitor services. Today, more than 270 million people visit our parks yearly, easy access is provided via highways and airports, and operating a business in our parks is extremely lucrative. While business is great for concessioners, the American people have failed to receive a fair return for the privilege of operating in their national parks. In 1994, while concessioners earned more than \$640 million from park operations, the American people received only \$19 million in franchise fees, or about 3 percent of gross receipts. To make matters worse, there is no competition in the awarding of concession contracts and companies receive possessory interest in structures in the public's parks. Possessory interest forces the American people to pay concessioners for the privilege of doing business in their parks. Moreover, possessory interest is not enjoyed by concessioners in sports stadiums or airports.

Our bill contains the text of legislation passed by the House in the 103d Congress which would completely overhaul concession policy. It requires contracts to be awarded on a competitive basis and provide a fair return to the American taxpayers. It eliminates possessory interest and allocates franchise fees to our parks to support a wide range of activities. At the same time, it protects the interests of river guides, outfitters, and other small businesses who provide specialized services and are overwhelmingly family-run operations. These provisions will ensure that the American people continue to receive high-quality services and begin to enjoy a fair return on the use of their resources.

Finally, this legislation will also generate additional revenue to support park operations by authorizing moderate fee increases at parks which are currently authorized to charge fees. By allowing fees to increase slightly at certain park units, we can generate badly needed revenue to improve park roads and trails and to safeguard increasingly threatened natural resources. It is estimated that this measure will generate \$30 million in revenue to maintain our parks. Importantly, these fees will go into a special fund in the Treasury which will be directly available to the Secretary of Interior for park-related purposes. This provision guarantees that fees paid by visitors will go to the parks and not be used to offset the deficit or to fund other programs. The American people are willing to pay a little more as long as they know that their entrance fees will be reinvested in the parks.

Mr. Speaker, by bringing H.R. 260 to the floor under Suspension of the Rules, the Republican leadership is denying Members on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to vote for a reasonable alternative. Once again, we see that talk about openness and giving Members of this body the opportunity to work their will is hollow. As a result, the American people are going to see their parks close or be sold to the highest bidder. These treasures are too important to be a pawn in a game of legislative chess. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 260.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is with both surprise and concern that a piece of legislation as far reaching, complex, and, yes, controversial, would be offered on the Suspension Calendar. This bill, H.R. 260, passed through the Resources Committee by a 34 to 8 vote which does, superficially, indicate there may be the $\frac{2}{3}$ support that is necessary for a suspension bill to pass. However, there are serious dissenting views that should be considered and debated by Members of Congress.

In addition, another bill was introduced by beginning of August by the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, Representative BILL RICHARDSON, that has bipartisan support. Two Republicans, Mr. BOEHLERT and myself, and two Democrats are original cosponsors. I feel very strongly that Members should be allowed to consider this thoughtful and comprehensive substitute bill, H.R. 2181, inasmuch as H.R. 260 is not the only choice we have to manage effective reform of our National Park System.

H.R. 2181 was introduced primarily in response to the more contentious sections of H.R. 260, including Section 103, National Park System Review Commission, which includes the establishment of what has been characterized as a Park Closing Commission. This section is very troublesome to me because I believe that it is unnecessary—a system already exists to close any park that does not meet specified standards. And it is overly threatening to the smaller, less glamorous parks in our system that lack a voice of advocacy, but represent an idea, a culture, or an area that is significant to our national heritage. I have two parks in my district that could come under this classification: Glen Echo Park and the C & O Canal Historical Park. I suspect that almost every Member of Congress has similar unheralded park in their district.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are entitled to a full discussion of H.R. 260 on the floor of the House.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 260, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN PRESIDIO PROPERTIES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1296), to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Presidio, located amidst the incomparable scenic splendor of the Golden Gate, is one of America's great natural and historic sites;

(2) the Presidio is the oldest continuously operated military post in the Nation dating from 1776, and was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1962;

(3) preservation of the cultural and historic integrity of the Presidio for public use recognizes its significant role in the history of the United States;

(4) the Presidio, in its entirety, is located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, in accordance with Public Law 92-589;

(5) the Presidio's significant natural, historic, scenic, cultural, and recreational resources must be managed in a manner which is consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management, and which protects the Presidio from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and historic and natural character of the area; and

(6) the Presidio can best be managed through an innovative public/private partnership that minimizes cost to the United States Treasury and makes efficient use of private sector resources that could be utilized in the public interest.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

(a) INTERIM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to manage leases in existence on the date of this Act for properties under the Administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and located at the Presidio. Upon the expiration of any such lease, the Secretary may extend the lease for a period terminating 6 months after the first meeting of the Presidio Trust at which a quorum is present. After the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not enter into any new leases for property at the Presidio to be transferred to the Presidio Trust under this Act. Notwithstanding section 1341 of title 31 of the United States Code, the proceeds from any such lease shall be retained by the Secretary and such proceeds shall be available, without further appropriation, for the preservation, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair and related expenses incurred with respect to Presidio properties. For purposes of any such lease, the Secretary may adjust the rental by taking into account any amounts to be expended by the lessee for preservation, maintenance, restoration, improvement, repair and related expenses with respect to properties within the Presidio.

(b) PUBLIC INFORMATION AND INTERPRETATION.—The Secretary shall be responsible, in cooperation with the Presidio Trust, for providing public interpretative services, visitor orientation and educational programs on all lands within the Presidio.

(c) OTHER.—Those lands and facilities within the Presidio that are not transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Presidio Trust shall continue to be managed by the Secretary. The Secretary and the Presidio Trust shall cooperate to ensure adequate public access to all portions of the Presidio.

(d) PARK SERVICE EMPLOYEES.—*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Trust shall have sole discretion over whether to employ persons previously employed by the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior. Career employees of the National Park Service, employed at the Presidio as of the time of the transfer of lands and facilities to the Presidio Trust, shall not be separated from the Service by reason of such transfer.*

SEC. 3. THE PRESIDIO TRUST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a wholly owned government corporation to be known as the Presidio Trust (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Trust").

(b) TRANSFER.—(1) Within 60 days after receipt of a request from the Trust for the transfer of any parcel within the area depicted as area B on the map entitled "Presidio Trust Number 1," dated June 1995, the Secretary shall transfer such parcel to the administrative jurisdiction of the Trust. Within one year after the first meeting of the Board of Directors of the Trust at which a quorum is present, the Board shall request the Secretary to transfer any remaining parcels within such area B. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Trust and in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Trust and the Secretary may jointly make technical and clerical revisions in the boundary depicted on such map. Such areas shall remain within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The Secretary shall retain those portions of the building identified as number 103 as the Secretary deems essential for use as a visitor center. The building shall be named the "William Penn Mott Visitor Center". With the consent of the Secretary, the Trust may at any time transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary any other properties within the Presidio which are surplus to the needs of the Trust and which serve essential purposes of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The Trust is encouraged to transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary open space areas which have a high public use potential and are contiguous to other lands administered by the Secretary.

(2) The Secretary shall transfer, with the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over any property, all leases, concessions, licenses, permits, and other agreements relating to such property. Upon the transfer of such property the Secretary shall transfer the unobligated balance of all funds appropriated to the Secretary for the operation of the Presidio, together with any revenues and unobligated funds associated with leases, concessions, licenses, permits, and agreements relating to properties transferred to the Trust.

(c) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers and management of the Trust shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") consisting of the following 7 members:

(A) The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee.

(B) Six individuals, who are not employees of the Federal Government, appointed by the President, who shall possess extensive knowledge and experience in one or more of the fields of city planning, finance, real estate, and resource conservation. At least 3 of

these individuals shall reside in the city and county of San Francisco. The President shall make the appointments referred to in this subparagraph within 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

(2) TERMS.—Members of the Board appointed under paragraph (1)(B) shall each serve for a term of 4 years, except that of the members first appointed, 3 shall serve for a term of 2 years. Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made, and any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his or her predecessor was appointed. No appointed director may serve more than 8 years in consecutive terms. No member of the Board of Directors may have a development or financial interest in any tenant or property of the Presidio.

(3) QUORUM.—Four members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business by the Board.

(4) ORGANIZATION AND COMPENSATION.—The Board shall organize itself in such a manner as it deems most appropriate to effectively carry out the authorized activities of the Trust. Board members shall serve without pay, but may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Trust.

(5) LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS.—Members of the Board of Directors shall not be considered Federal employees by virtue of their membership on the Board, except for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and the Ethics in Government Act.

(6) PUBLIC LIAISON.—The Board shall meet at least 3 times per year in San Francisco and at least one meeting shall be open to the public. The Board shall establish procedures for providing public information and opportunities for public comment regarding policy, planning, and design issues through the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission.

(d) DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES.—In accordance with the purposes set forth in this Act and in section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes", approved October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-589; 86 Stat. 1299; 16 U.S.C. 460bb), and in accordance with the general objectives of the general management plan approved for the Presidio, the Trust shall manage the leasing, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair and improvement of property within the Presidio which is under its administrative jurisdiction. The Trust may participate in the development of programs and activities at the properties that have been transferred to the Trust. In exercising its powers and duties, the Trust shall have the following authorities:

(1) The Trust is authorized to manage, lease, maintain, rehabilitate and improve, either directly or by agreement, those properties within the Presidio which are transferred to the Trust by the Secretary.

(2)(A) The Trust is authorized to negotiate and enter into such agreements, leases, contracts and other arrangements with any person, firm, association, organization, corporation or governmental entity, including without limitation entities of Federal, State and local governments (except any agreement to convey fee title to any property located at the Presidio) as are necessary and appropriate to finance and carry out its authorized activities. Agreements under this paragraph may be entered into without regard to section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b).

(B) Except as provided in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), Federal laws and regula-

tions governing procurement by Federal agencies shall apply to the Trust.

(C) In exercising authority under section 303(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)) relating to simplified purchase procedures, the Trust is authorized, to use as the dollar limit of each purchase or contract under this subsection an amount which does not exceed \$500,000.

(D) In carrying out the requirement of section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416), the Trust is authorized to furnish the Secretary of Commerce for publication notices of proposed procurement actions, to use as the applicable dollar threshold for each expected procurement an amount which does not exceed \$1,000,000.

(E) The Trust shall establish procedures for lease agreements and other agreements for use and occupancy of Presidio facilities, including a requirement that in entering into such agreements the Trust shall obtain reasonable competition.

(F) The Trust shall develop a comprehensive program for management of those lands and facilities within the Presidio which are transferred to the Trust. Such program shall be designed to reduce costs to the maximum extent possible. In carrying out this program, the Trust shall be treated as a successor in interest to the National Park Service with respect to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other environmental compliance statutes. Such program shall consist of—

(i) demolition of all structures which cannot be cost-effectively rehabilitated and are not of the highest degree of historical significance,

(ii) new construction which would be limited to replacement of existing structures of similar size in existing areas of development, and

(iii) examination of a full range of reasonable options for carrying out routine administrative and facility management programs. The Trust shall consult with the Secretary in the preparation of this program.

(3) The Trust is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation and duties of an executive director and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may pay them without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, title 5, United States Code (relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates).

(4) To augment or encourage the use of non-Federal funds to finance capital improvements on Presidio properties transferred to its jurisdiction, the Trust, in addition to its other authorities, shall have the following authorities:

(A) The authority to guarantee any lender against loss of principal or interest on any loan, provided that (i) the terms of the guarantee are approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, (ii) adequate guarantee authority is provided in appropriations Acts, and (iii) such guarantees are structured so as to minimize potential cost to the Federal Government. No loan guarantee under this Act shall cover more than 75 percent of the unpaid balance of the loan. The Secretary of the Treasury shall collect a commercially reasonable guarantee fee in connection with each loan guaranteed under this Act. The authority to enter into any such loan guarantee agreement shall expire at the end of 12 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) The authority, subject to available appropriations, to make loans to the occupants of property managed by the Trust for the

preservation, restoration, maintenance, or repair of such property.

(C) The authority to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, but only if the Secretary of the Treasury agrees to purchase such obligations after determining that the projects to be funded from the proceeds thereof are credit worthy and that a repayment schedule is established. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such chapter are extended to include any purchase of such notes or obligations acquired by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection. The aggregate amount of obligations issued under this subparagraph which are outstanding at any one time may not exceed \$50,000,000. Obligations issued under this subparagraph shall be in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. No funds appropriated to the Trust may be used for repayment of principal or interest on, or redemption of, obligations issued under this paragraph. All obligations purchased under authority of this subparagraph must be authorized in advance in appropriations Acts.

(D) The Trust shall be deemed to be a public agency for the purpose of entering into joint exercise of powers agreements pursuant to California government code section 6500 and following.

(5) The Trust may solicit and accept donations of funds, property, supplies, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, and other private or public entities for the purpose of carrying out its duties. The Trust shall maintain philanthropic liaison with the Golden Gate National Park Association, the fund raising association for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

(6) Notwithstanding section 1341 of title 31 of the United States Code, all proceeds received by the Trust shall be retained by the Trust, and such proceeds shall be available, without further appropriation, for the preservation, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair and related expenses incurred with respect to Presidio properties under its jurisdiction. Upon the request of the Trust, the Secretary of the Treasury shall invest excess moneys of the Trust in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Trust.

(7) The Trust may sue and be sued in its own name to the same extent as the Federal Government. Litigation arising out of the activities of the Trust shall be conducted by the Attorney General, as needed; except that the Trust may retain private attorneys to provide advice and counsel, and to represent the Trust in proceedings to enforce and defend the contractual obligations of the Trust.

(8) The Trust shall have all necessary and proper powers for the exercise of the authorities invested in it.

(9) For the purpose of compliance with applicable laws and regulations concerning properties transferred to the Trust by the Secretary, the Trust shall negotiate directly with regulatory authorities.

(e) INSURANCE.—The Trust shall procure insurance against any loss in connection with the properties managed by it or its authorized activities as is reasonable and customary.

(f) BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE.—The Trust shall bring all properties under its jurisdiction into compliance with Federal building codes and regulations appropriate to use and occupancy within 10 years after the enactment of this Act.

(g) TAXES.—The Trust shall be exempt from all taxes and special assessments of every kind in the State of California, and its political subdivisions, including the city and county of San Francisco.

(h) FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND REPORT.—(1) The Trust shall be treated as a wholly owned Government corporation subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Government Corporation Control Act). Financial statements of the Trust shall be audited annually in accordance with section 9105 of title 31 of the United States Code.

(2) At the end of each calendar year, the Trust shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments for the prior fiscal year. The report also shall include a section that describes in general terms the Trust's goals for the current fiscal year.

(i) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary from exercising any of the Secretary's lawful powers within the Presidio.

(j) LEASING.—In managing and leasing the properties transferred to it, the Trust should consider the extent to which prospective tenants maximize the contribution to the implementation of the General Management Plan for the Presidio and to the generation of revenues to offset costs of the Presidio. The Trust shall give priority to the following categories of tenants: tenants that enhance the financial viability of the Presidio thereby contributing to the preservation of the scenic beauty and natural character of the area; tenants that facilitate the cost-effective preservation of historic buildings through their reuse of such buildings, or tenants that promote through their activities the general programmatic content of the plan.

(k) REVERSION.—If the Trust reasonably determines by a two-thirds vote of its Board of Directors that it has materially failed to, or cannot, carry out the provisions of this Act, all lands and facilities administered by the Trust shall revert to the Secretary of Defense to be disposed of in accordance with section 2905(b) of the Defense Authorization Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 1809), except that—

(1) the terms and conditions of all agreements and loans regarding such lands and facilities entered into by the Trust shall be binding on any successor in interest; and

(2) the city of San Francisco shall have the first right of refusal to accept all lands and facilities formerly administered by the Trust.

(l) LIMITATIONS ON FUNDING.—(1) From amounts made available to the Secretary for the operation of areas within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, not more than \$25,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act in each fiscal year after the enactment of this Act until the plan is submitted under paragraph (2). Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(2) Within one year after establishment of the Trust, the Trust shall submit to Congress a plan which includes a schedule of annual decreasing Federally appropriated funding such as will achieve total self-sufficiency for the Trust within 12 complete fiscal years after establishment of the Trust. That plan shall provide for annual reductions in Federally appropriated funding such that the Trust will be 80 percent self-sufficient at the end of 7 complete fiscal years after establishment. The plan shall provide for elimination

of all Federally appropriated funding for public safety and fire protection purposes on lands or facilities administered by the Trust at the end of 5 complete fiscal years after establishment of the Trust. For each of the 11 fiscal years after fiscal year 1997, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Trust not more than the amounts specified in such plan. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(m) GAO AUDIT.—Ten years after the date of establishment of the Trust, the General Accounting Office shall conduct a complete audit of the activities of the Trust and shall report the results of that audit to the appropriate congressional committees. The General Accounting Office shall include in that audit an analysis of the ability of the Trust to initiate payments to the Treasury.

(n) SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—If any provisions of this Act or the application thereof to any body, agency, situation, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other bodies, agencies, situations, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1296, bipartisan legislation introduced by the gentlewoman from San Francisco, which addresses what to do with the Presidio of San Francisco. Mr. Speaker, because of a single sentence in a 23-year-old piece of legislation, the Presidio has the potential to become the most expensive area in the National Park System. I believe that the framework outlined in this legislation for future management of the Presidio embodies the type of innovative thinking and reduced dependence on the Federal Government which voters sought last November, and I commend Ms. PELOSI for leading the way with her legislation.

In 1989, the Department of the Army, through the base closure process, determined that the Presidio was surplus to their needs. The 1972 Act establishing Golden Gate National Recreation Area called for the administrative jurisdiction of the Presidio to be transferred to the National Park Service, if it was ever determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army. Thus began a lengthy, multi-million dollar planning effort by the NPS to determine the future of the area.

To their credit, from the outset the NPS recognized that the 6 million square feet of building space at the Presidio was far more space than the NPS could use. With hospitals, warehousing, 1500 housing units, fast food outlets, bowling alleys, churches, gymnasiums, as well as over 500 historic buildings, it was an area unlike

any ever managed by the NPS. Unfortunately, the NPS plan failed to examine all the reasonable alternatives for the Presidio.

After spending nearly 4 years and over \$1 million, the NPS came up with a plan estimated to cost nearly \$700 million in one-time capital expenditures and \$40 million in annual operating costs for the foreseeable future to implement. It was a plan with lots of pretty pictures and interesting ideas about a world center for social, cultural, and environmental awareness; but it was a plan with no basis in reality. In fact, the plan was so unrealistically dependent on Federal funding, that if allowed to go forward it appeared likely that the resources of the Presidio would be in great jeopardy. The media is already reporting how the Presidio has fallen into disrepair in the 11 months since the National Park Service took over the area and began implementation of their plan.

Under the National Park Service plan, the cost to operate the 1,400 acres of Golden Gate National Recreation Area within the Presidio was going to be more than twice as much as the most expensive park in the park system; Yellowstone National Park which costs about \$20 million per year to operate its 2.3 million acres.

While the Presidio is a beautiful location, and certainly one of the most outstanding urban settings in the country, if not in the world, it is not the type of area which should be managed by the National Park Service. Based on considerable review of the situation over the last several years, the committee has come to the conclusion that the most effective way to reduce costs at the Presidio, and ultimately to save it, is to turn management of large portions of it over to those with expertise in management of such properties.

Therefore, this legislation establishes the nonprofit Presidio Trust to take over management of about 80 percent of the Presidio, consisting of most of the built environment. Under the proposal before us today, the National Park Service would retain responsibility for management of the undeveloped open space areas and primary recreational use activities, as well as key historic structures, such as Fort Point. This is not a new idea. In fact, in reviewing the legislative history of the 1972 act, that is precisely the role which was envisioned for the National Park Service by the author of the law.

Under terms of the bill, Federal funding for portions of the Presidio transferred to the Presidio Trust would be phased out after 12 years. This represents a savings of hundreds of millions of dollars compared to the plan developed by the National Park Service.

It has not been easy to convince those who still believe that the Federal Government has all the answers and unlimited funds that such a solution is the best one for the Presidio. In fact, some remain unconvinced. For this

reason, I appreciate even more the efforts of Ms. PELOSI to work to resolve my concerns and those of others on this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill and look forward to swift action on this bill in the Senate.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1296, as reported from the committee, represents what we hope is a workable compromise regarding the management of the Presidio. This important measure was originally introduced by my good friend and colleague, NANCY PELOSI. The gentlewoman is to be commended for her hard work and dedication in addressing the issues facing the management of the Presidio. Representative PELOSI has worked tirelessly to protect her constituents' interests and the national interests at the Presidio. I commend her for seeking to protect the nationally significant resources of the Presidio while being mindful of budgetary restraints.

The Presidio contains a combination of natural, historical, and recreational resources which are both significant and unique. There should be no question about the high degree of national significance of the Presidio, nor about our obligation to preserve and interpret these resources for present and future generations.

The real question facing the Congress is how do we succeed in preserving the precious national assets of the Presidio in a manner which is sensitive to the budgetary restraints of the Federal Government. Already the Presidio is being operated at a significant cost savings when compared to its previous operation as a military post. Representative PELOSI's legislation is an innovative solution for operating the Presidio in the most cost-effective manner. This is a bipartisan effort that has not only had the active support of the administration, but also of the Governor, the mayor, and the San Francisco community, particularly the business community.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment in the nature of a substitute that was agreed to in the committee is a compromise document. It is something that, nevertheless, preserves a great part of our American heritage while reducing the cost to the Federal Government. I am concerned though, that the amendment sets unrealistic deadlines for achieving financial self-sufficiency. However, I recognize that we all had to compromise in order to reach agreement and I want to thank Mr. HANSEN for all his work on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move ahead with H.R. 1296. This legislation is the

only viable solution to dealing with the Presidio. As much as some may like the idea, sale, or transfer will not work. Those options would involve a cumbersome and costly 10-15 year process with no assurance of success in the end.

I support H.R. 1296, as amended, and would urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for yielding this time to me, and for his cooperation in bringing this legislation to the floor, and his kind words about this bill. I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in bringing H.R. 1296 before the House today. As chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has worked tirelessly providing the leadership and the framework for the legislation before us today to reduce Federal exposure at the Presidio while preserving the Presidio in the public domain. Chairman HANSEN has been firm in his intent to reduce costs, steadfast in his pursuit of a compromise, and determined in his bipartisan approach. I am grateful to him for his efforts on behalf of the Presidio. The ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], has been a defender of the Presidio for many years. As always, I am grateful for his leadership, advice, and support. Phil Burton, a former Member of this body, a leader here, would be proud of the gentleman from California's role in this effort. I also appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG]. I want to thank the Members on the Republican side who believed in H.R. 1296 enough to cosponsor the legislation: the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]; and on our side my colleague, the gentleman from San Francisco, CA [Mr. LANTOS]. I appreciate their confidence in the Presidio Trust legislation and their desire to see this bill passed by Congress today.

Before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, I also want to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of my staff person, my administrative assistant, Judy Lemons, who also worked on the Interior Committee, when it was called that, under Phillip Burton on the subcommittee. She was present at the birth of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. When we celebrate the Presidio from post to park, it will be in large measure because of the hard work of Judy Lemons, and her work would not have been successful without the cooperation, advice, and counsel of Steve Hodag on the minority side, and

I want to publicly thank Steve. We have not always agreed on the approach to the Presidio, but, under the leadership of gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the framework for compromise that he established, I think we produced a great product that will reach our goals of reducing cost to the taxpayers while preserving this national treasure.

Before again I go any further, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge with great gratitude the role that the U.S. Army has played in the Presidio. They have created the rich historic and environmental resource that it is today. They planted the trees, they preserved the history, they trained our soldiers, and they have left a great legacy to our Nation, and so it is in that spirit that we move this legislation to take the Presidio from post to park in a way that preserves the heritage that they invested in for so long.

Support for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, of which the Presidio will be a part, has, as I mentioned, we have bipartisan supporters for this legislation, but bipartisan support for urban parks, the GGNRA, along with Gateway NRA in New York was championed by President Nixon, his belief that, quote, parks should be brought to the people, end of quote. There was strong bipartisan support in Congress for these urban national park initiatives when they were approved in 1972. At that time former Representative Phillip Burton authorized the legislation, authorized the creation of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I will place my full statement in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but I just did want to say briefly that H.R. 1296 creates a Presidio Trust to implement the conversion from post to park. This bill was introduced on March 22, 1995. It represents a bipartisan, and I keep saying that word, effort to merge economic realities, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] acknowledged, with park stewardship in order to maximize revenue potential and minimize the cost to American taxpayers. I believe the legislation achieves these twin goals in its plan for the first time actually to reduce Federal cost for our national park.

Concerns were raised last year, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] mentioned, about the cost of operating the Presidio under the National Park Service. The majority and minority in this Congress have worked to address many of these concerns. That is why I am so proud that we have the support of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] in this legislation. The version of H.R. 1296 before us today actually is the Hansen substitute, reflects many areas of compromise which were intended to protect taxpayers as well as to preserve the unique qualities of the Presidio, as I have described. Mr. Speaker, it calls for self-sufficiency in a time certain.

Mr. Speaker, in the interests of time, as I say, I am going to place more of

my statement in the RECORD, but I would like to state for the RECORD publicly that the Presidio Trust would comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Landmark Act, the GGNRA general management plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has expired.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in addition to complying with all of these laws, H.R. 1296, Presidio Trust legislation, support covers a broad spectrum from environmental groups, community organizations, and historic preservation groups to national business leaders. The ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], mentioned some of these, and I will just briefly mention them and place in the RECORD leaders and lists from these organizations and lists of other organizations, a letter from the National Historic Trust for Preservation, the Sierra Club, the Presidio Task Force, People for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco Tomorrow, and a letter signed by some of the Nation's leading CEO's and business leaders strongly supporting the legislation. The list goes on and on. As the gentleman from New Mexico mentioned, the Governor of California, the mayor of San Francisco, and also the League of Women Voters. A complete list is included for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say the picture of the Presidio in the GGNRA, of which this is a part, would not be complete without mentioning the work of Amy Meier, who has been engaged in efforts to preserve the GGNRA and Presidio for almost 25 years. There are hundreds of others in our community who were involved in the 5-year planning process for the Presidio. Community leaders from the San Francisco Bay area have also devoted their considerable talent and time to participate in the community and in congressional hearings on behalf of the Presidio Trust. They are stalwarts beyond comparison, and I greatly appreciate their work.

In further closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my many colleagues who have made a special effort to learn more about the Presidio and the concept of the trust. Many of the San Francisco Bay area community deserve praise for their constant support and effort on behalf of the Presidio and for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in passing this legislation we will not only set up a model for how we can go from post to park, a model for how we can fund national parks in the least exposure to the taxpayer, but also a model of bipartisan support in this Congress on how we can work together to achieve our goals, aside from once again urging our

colleagues to support the Presidio legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Chairman YOUNG, Chairman HANSEN, and ranking member GEORGE MILLER, in bring H.R. 1296 before the House today.

Mr. HANSEN and I have worked side by side over recent months to develop a bill that would reduce the Federal exposure at the Presidio while preserving the Presidio in the public domain. Chairman HANSEN has been firm in his intent to reduce costs, steadfast in his pursuit of a compromise and determined in his bipartisan approach. I am grateful to him for his efforts on behalf of the Presidio.

The ranking member, Mr. MILLER, has been a defender of the Presidio for many years. As always, I am grateful for his leadership, advice, and support. Phil Burton would be proud of his part in this effort. I also appreciate the cooperation of Chairman DON YOUNG.

I also want to thank the members who believe in H.R. 1296 and cosponsored the bill: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. LANTOS. I appreciate their confidence in the Presidio Trust and their desire to see this bill passed by Congress.

A RICH MILITARY HISTORY

Many of you are familiar with the Presidio, and many of you have visited or served in the military at the Presidio. It represents a harmony of history that spans a history as old as our democracy. Since 1776, the Presidio has served under the flags of three nations—Spain, Mexico, and the United States.

This rich military history is blended with a cultural landscape which includes the Ohlone Indians who lived in the area 5,000 years before the Spanish arrived, the Spanish who colonized California, the American pioneers who settled the West, followers of the gold rush, and immigrants from Asia and soldiers returning from war whose first sight of home was the Presidio.

The Presidio has played a role in every major American military conflict since the Mexican-American War. In 1898, thousands of troops camped in tent cities awaiting shipment to the Philippines. The returning wounded were treated in the Army's first permanent general hospital—now Letterman Hospital.

With the attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States entered World War II, and Presidio soldiers dug foxholes along nearby beaches. Almost 2 million soldiers embarked from the Presidio to fight in the Pacific. In the 1950's the Nike missile defense system was situated around the Golden Gate and the Presidio became the headquarters for the 6th Army. Troops from the Presidio have come to the aid of San Franciscans during two major earthquakes. The U.S. Army has been a good neighbor and we appreciate its important contribution to our community and service to our Nation.

AN ENVIRONMENTAL TREASURE

Speaking objectively, the Presidio's natural environment and its scenic panoramas are unsurpassed in the world. At the confluence of the Pacific Ocean and San Francisco Bay, the Presidio anchors the Golden Gate—a symbol to west coast immigrants much like the Statue of Liberty.

The Presidio's natural areas are a refuge to native plants and wildlife. Its urban forest of almost one-half million trees planted by the Army over 100 years ago is surrounded by

acres of sand dunes and coastal bluffs. It is the site of the world's only urban biosphere reserve designated by the United Nations. This natural backdrop provides recreational activities and opportunities for outdoor exploration to the Presidio's many visitors.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area, of which the Presidio is a part, is the most visited national park in the system—with over 20 million annual visitors. Visitation to the Presidio is expected to double within the next few years to reach approximately 9 million people.

While this presents only a snapshot of the Presidio, I hope it gives you an image of the graceful contours—the historic, cultural, and natural elements—that embrace a special place.

FROM POST TO PARK

Through the initiative of former Representative Phillip Burton, Congress in 1972 authorized the creation of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area [GGNRA], a magnificent collection of park and historic sites surrounding San Francisco's Golden Gate—Public Law 92-589.

Creation of the GGNRA, along with Gateway NRA in New York, was championed by President Nixon in his belief that parks should be brought to the people. There was strong bipartisan support in Congress for these urban national park initiatives when they were approved in 1972.

The Presidio of San Francisco was included in the GGNRA authorization so that its lands would also be incorporated into the GGNRA when no longer required by the Department of Defense [DOD]. The language in Public Law 92-589 states: "When all or any substantial portion of the remainder of the Presidio is determined by the Department of Defense to be in excess of its needs, such lands shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary (of Interior) for the purposes of this Act."

In 1988, the Presidio was included in the first round of base closures recommended by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission—BRAC I—Public Law 100-526. Subsequent to this recommendation, BRAC II recommended that the 6th Army Headquarters be retained at the Presidio on an interim basis and under a lease agreement with the National Park Service. An agreement was negotiated and later withdrawn by a DOD decision to permanently relocate the 6th Army Headquarters elsewhere.

In the 5 years following this decision, hundreds of people from the local community participated in the planning sessions to develop the general management plan. In 1993, I introduced H.R. 3433 to create a new management entity, a trust, to lease Presidio properties in cooperation with the National Park Service. The concept of a trust was included in the National Park Service Presidio General Management Plan [GMP] and, hearings were conducted by the House Subcommittee on National Parks on May 10, 1994, and H.R. 3433 was passed by the House on August 18, 1994, by a vote of 245 to 168.

H.R. 3433 was approved unanimously—20 to 0—by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on September 21, 1994. The Senate failed to complete action on H.R. 3433 in the final days of the 103d Congress. On September 30, 1994, the Presidio officially became part of the GGNRA.

WHERE WE ARE TODAY

H.R. 1296, to create a Presidio trust, was introduced on March 22, 1995, represents a bipartisan effort to merge economic reality with park stewardship in order to maximize revenue potential and minimize the cost to American taxpayers. I believe the legislation achieves these twin goals in its plan to, for the first time, actually reduce Federal costs for a national park.

Concerns were raised last year about the cost of operating the Presidio under the National Park Service. The majority and minority in this Congress have worked to address many of these concerns. The version of H.R. 1296 before you today reflects many areas of compromise which are intended to protect taxpayers as well as to preserve the unique qualities of the Presidio that I have described. Again, I would like to emphasize the importance of providing a workable period of time in which the Presidio trust could demonstrate its success. The Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation [PADC] engaged in a similar rehabilitation project to restore the Avenue of the Presidents here in our nation's capital. It took over 20 years to accomplish the restoration, but it is done and it is a success. Chairman HANSEN has been very supportive in his efforts to develop a framework for success. I hope these efforts will be continued as the Senate considers H.R. 1296 so that cost reduction remains a primary goal, but also so that we create a model equipped with a time frame sufficient to meet the challenge before us.

SUPPORTERS OF H.R. 1296

The support for H.R. 1296 covers a broad spectrum—from environmental groups, community organizations, and historic preservation groups to national business leaders.

A letter from the National Trust for Historic Preservation states: "The Presidio is one of this country's most significant military sites, and its cultural, historic and natural resources are extraordinary . . . The Presidio needs the catalyst and well-managed oversight that only a management vehicle such as the Presidio Trust can provide."

A letter from the Sierra Club Presidio Task Force states: "H.R. 1296 will enable the Presidio to be a sustainable national park unit, managed for the benefit of ours and future generations. That is good park policy, good fiscal policy and good governmental policy."

A letter from people for a GGNRA states: "Our nation deserves to have the Golden Gate, the western entrance to the United States, honored with a park that preserves its splendor and its history. All the efforts of the private sector are needed to make that preservation a success."

A letter from San Francisco Tomorrow states: "In order to preserve the historic and scenic Presidio for all people for all time, San Francisco Tomorrow endorses the Presidio Trust to enable the Presidio National Park to pay its own way with minimal dependence on public funds."

A letter cosigned by some of the Nation's leading CEO's and business leaders states: "We strongly support legislation currently before your committee that would bring efficient, business-like management and cost-effective financing to the Presidio, a National Historic Landmark and National Park at California's scenic Golden Gate."

The list goes on to include many more supporters—the League of Women Voters, the Governor of California, the mayor of San Francisco; a complete list of neighborhood organizations and other groups is included for the RECORD.

This picture of the Presidio and the GGNRA, of which it is a part, would be incomplete without mentioning the work of Amy Meyer who has been engaged in efforts to preserve the GGNRA and Presidio for almost 25 years. There are hundreds of others who were involved in the 5-year planning process for the Presidio. Community leaders from San Francisco have also devoted their considerable talents and time to participate in the community and in Congressional hearings on behalf of the Presidio Trust. They are stalwarts beyond comparison and I greatly appreciate their hard work.

PRO BONO AND PHILANTHROPIC SUPPORT

The concept of a Presidio trust is based on the independent study of 19 management models which recommended this particular paradigm as workable at the Presidio. All of these studies emphasized the need for autonomy, flexibility, long-term leasing and private sector expertise. The Presidio trust concept was then embraced by the National Park Service in its Presidio general management plan. The Presidio has probably been the subject of more independent analyses than any base closure in the country. The list of private sector, pro bono consultants who have reviewed this project include Arthur Anderson & Co., McKinsey & Co., Keyser Marston Associates, Mancini-Mills, Morrison and Foerster and Curtis Feeny of the Stanford Management Co. They have consistently recommended the management structure outlined in H.R. 1296.

In addition to the efforts provided by these consultants, considerable pro bono services—amounting to almost \$4 million—have been provided to the Presidio. This effort was begun by the Presidio council, comprised of prominent professionals from the fields of business, finance, education, environment, architecture and planning, government and philanthropy and chaired by James Harvey, chairman of TransAmerica. These national leaders organized in 1991 to provide planning assistance to the park service and to solicit contributions to the Presidio.

This philanthropic campaign is continuing under the leadership of the Golden Gate National Park Association [GGNPA] where over \$15 million has been raised for the GGNRA since 1982 and another \$10 million is expected to be raised for Presidio improvements to supplement the major philanthropic effort. A major requirement for philanthropic support is creation of a Presidio trust to manage the Presidio's properties.

CONFIRMATION OF MARKETABILITY

H.R. 1296 includes a deadline for total self sufficiency in 12 years. While I recognize the need for the trust to achieve self sufficiency over a given time period, I must add that the time frame outlined in H.R. 1296 is not supported by any of the independent studies that have been conducted on the Presidio's financial viability.

Because of the need to reduce costs and to demonstrate the intent to reduce costs in the legislation, advice was sought from a known real estate entity which faced a challenge

similar to the Presidio's. An independent analyst was engaged to review the park service figures and to determine the financial basis on which the legislation could stand.

After reviewing the Presidio's properties, the analysis confirmed the Presidio's marketability and revenue potential, and that revenues of between \$15 to \$25 million could be generated within a 12- to 15-year period. In testimony before the Senate, Curtis Feeny, vice president for real estate with the Stanford Management Co. stated: "The key to meeting the financial challenge posed by the Presidio is to capture the value of the property in the form of capital that can then be used to improve and maintain the park. I believe the value of the Presidio's real estate, if used in combination with cost reduction measures, will enable the Presidio's built environment to pay its own way over time."

H.R. 1296

The Presidio trust would provide for the long-term lease of buildings to rent-paying tenants. There are over 800 structures at the Presidio, comprising more than 6 million square feet of space, most of which possess revenue potential to sustain the Presidio's real estate and to realize a savings to the Federal Government. Over half of these structures are historic. Revenues from leases would be retained and used to offset costs at the Presidio, reducing the need for federal appropriations. Capital improvements would be financed primarily from private sources and tenant financing.

The trust would be governed by a board of seven members, including the Secretary of the Interior and members from the fields of property and financial management and resource conservation. Congress would have oversight of the trust with the requirement that an annual report and audit be conducted. At the end of 10 years, the General Accounting Office would conduct a comprehensive audit of the trust's financial activities. The Presidio trust would be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. The net effect of this financing structure would sustain the trust and reduce overall park operations and the need for federal appropriations.

A number of protections are provided in H.R. 1296 which would restrict development of the Presidio and ensure public participation. Under the legislation, public access and open space are preserved. The Golden Gate National Recreation Advisory Commission would continue its role as a conduit for public comment and information. At least one annual public board meeting in San Francisco would be required.

The trust would comply with the National Historic Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. There are no exemptions for its operations and nothing in this bill would affect the national historic landmark status of the Presidio. The trust must also act in accordance with the GGNRA's park purposes identified in the enabling legislation and the general objectives of the general management plan. I might add that it is unique in the legislative process to reference a general management plan at all and the inclusion of this language is considered extraordinary.

Limits on new construction are included in the leasing and management program to be developed jointly by the trust and the park service. No board member is to have any financial interest in the Presidio and all board

members must comply with the requirements of the Ethics in Government Act and Federal financial disclosure policy. In short, Mr. Speaker, the laws that apply to the GGNRA also apply to the trust.

H.R. 1296 costs less than last year's bill because rehabilitation costs are transferred to tenants. Costs are further reduced through streamlined management, aggressive leasing, long-term leases, more demolition, broader tenancies and phased-in code compliance. Last year's cost estimates included both operations and capital improvements which resulted in a higher figure that many assumed was for operations only. Operations would be substantially reduced through creation of the Presidio trust and most capital costs would be borne by tenants.

The Presidio trust would manage the revenue-producing properties with the goal of self-sufficiency in a national park context and the National Park Service would operate the open-space areas of the Presidio. While the National Park Service has been a good steward of the Presidio, I believe a stronger effort is warranted on their part to recognize the fiscal reality that exists and to take immediate steps to reduce costs. In light of the progress on H.R. 1296 in Congress, I hope plans are underway to downscale operations, administrative costs and staff so that the trust will have the benefit of maximizing the federal investment in the Presidio. Park service costs can be cut and they should be—starting now.

A hearing on H.R. 1296 was conducted by the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands on May 16, 1995, and the legislation was marked up by the subcommittee on June 27, 1995. The full Resources Committee reported H.R. 1296 on July 12, 1995, for floor consideration. In addition to this committee review of the legislation, many members of the Appropriations and Resources Committees in the House and Senate have visited the Presidio to review its progress.

Crafted in the context of our current fiscal and political landscape, H.R. 1296 is a reflection of cost consciousness, innovative thinking, bipartisan cooperation, and a strong appreciation for the natural and historic landscape with which we, as members of our Nation's highest representative body, have been temporarily entrusted.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I understand quite well the difficulty that each of us faces in the current fiscal environment. We must reduce spending where we can and in such a way as to protect our people and our national heritage. Our charge is to be both cost conscious and innovative.

For nearly 150 years, the Federal Government has invested in the Presidio as an Army post; this investment should be protected. The best way to protect this asset is by creating a management and financial mechanism that will enable the Presidio to be used and to pay for itself.

H.R. 1296 is a good government approach that recognizes fiscal realities and offers a less costly, private-sector approach to management of our important federal assets at the Presidio. It provides a means to utilize valuable real estate assets to underwrite a broader public purpose.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my many colleagues who have made a special effort to learn more about the Presidio and the

concept of the trust. Members of the San Francisco community also deserve great praise for their constant support and efforts on behalf of preserving the Presidio for future generations. Our actions today are in keeping with the leadership of Phillip Burton to preserve this great national treasure.

I further want to acknowledge the U.S. Army for creating the rich historic and environmental resource it is today. They planted the trees, preserved our history, trained our soldiers, and left a great legacy to our nation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this cost-saving measure. Vote "yes" on H.R. 1296.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDIO TRUST BUSINESS LEADERS

AirTouch Communications.
Bank of America NT & SA.
Basic American, Inc.
Bay Area Council.
Bay Area Economic Forum.
The Gap, Inc.
The Glen Ellen Company.
Richard Goldman & Co.
Hellman and Friedman.
Hispanic Contractors Association.
International Wine Marketing Association.
Lane Publishing.
Leach Capital.
McKesson Corporation.
Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
Presidio Council.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.
San Francisco Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.
Scotch Plywood Co.
Swinerton & Walberg.
Texas Pacific Group.
Transamerica Corporation.

COMMUNITY AND CIVIC LEADERS

Governor Wilson, State of California.
State Assembly, California Legislature.
Mayor Jordan, City of San Francisco.
Board of Supervisors, City of San Francisco.
Bret Harte Terrace and Francisco Street Neighborhood Association.
Golden Gate National Park Association.
League of Women Voters of California.
League of Women Voters of San Francisco.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Los Californianos.
Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning.
North Beach Neighbors.
People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors.
San Francisco Bay Area Interfaith Coalition.
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Institute of Architects.
American Society of Landscape Architects.
Asian American Architects and Engineers.
Earth Island Institute.
Environmental Defense Fund Fort Mason Center.
Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore Advisory Commission.
Laborers' International Union of North America.
League of Conservation Voters.
National Park System Advisory Board.
National Parks and Conservation Association.
National Japanese American Historical Society.
Natural Resources Defense Council.
Sierra Club.

Travel Industry Association of America.
Trust for Public Land.
The Wilderness Society.
William Penn Mott, Jr Memorial Fund.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I really rise to thank the members of the committee who have worked so terribly hard on behalf of this legislation. It has taken a great deal of tenacity and it has taken a great deal of patience to bring this legislation to the floor but it is clear that this legislation is in the best interest of the Nation and it is in the best interest of the Presidio.

One need only stop for a moment at the Presidio to recognize immediately why this wonderful, wonderful national asset has such broad popular support across the Nation from every conceivable part of American society, but bringing all those disparate parts together is hard work and takes a great deal of patience and a great deal of counsel. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman PELOSI, provided the strategy, the counsel, and the patience; and our colleague, the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. HANSEN], provided the counsel and a great deal of patience in dealing with this legislation.

What has emerged is a bipartisan piece of legislation supported by every level of government, every level of citizen group, every level of national organization for the preservation for the Presidio. There was no question that the Presidio was going to become a park. That has been done. The question and the challenge has been how can we best support that park, finance that park and deliver all of the assets and all of the uses of the park to the American people and to those of us who live in the San Francisco Bay area. This legislation achieves those goals while trying to get the very best bang for the buck for the taxpayers and trying to make sure that we can maintain all of the reasons and all of the assets of the Presidio that make it such a charming addition, an important addition to the Park Service, and to the cultural history of this Nation and of the bay area that that long history will be preserved with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. There really is no other alternative. This legislation was born out of months and weeks and hours of deliberations of other ways of meeting the goals and the needs of support for the Presidio, and that is what has emerged out of those deliberations. I would hope that the House would support it overwhelmingly. I would hope that they recognize that if this is successful, this is, in fact, the blueprint for how we can work out arrangements for other assets within the Federal Government's park system and preserve system so that they can be both utilized and they can be properly sup-

ported so that we will not diminish their value, their characteristics, and their importance to both the Nation and to the regions.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank Judy Lemons, who has worked terribly hard, Steve Hodapp, who came at this, with all of the support and efforts and difference of views of various constituency groups, and allowed us to fashion this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for the fine work that she has done on this. I do not know if the people in the bay area realize the hundreds of hours she and her staff put into this and they should be very proud of her work. Without her work, I would guarantee Members this would not be in front of us today. There is no question, she is a very persistent legislator.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In summary, I want to reiterate what the chairman of the subcommittee said. I think the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] who has worked many years on this bill, many, many years to get it through, I think they deserve enormous credit and we should pass this bill. It is good legislation. I think we can look at it to deal with other issues as we look at dealing with parks in the future, instead of park closure commissions. I think this is a good bill, and I have no further requests for time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for those of you who might not be familiar with the Presidio, it is the southern anchorage of the Golden Gate Bridge and the centerpiece of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area—the most visited national park in the entire National Park System.

The entire Presidio was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1962. It is a showcase of architectural styles dating from the Civil War. It contains 876 structures, over half of which are of historic or cultural significance.

In addition, the Presidio is the only United Nations designated International Biosphere in an urban area. It is home to 21 rare and endangered species and 10 rare plant communities that have disappeared in the rest of San Francisco. It encompasses 300 acres of historic forest planted by the U.S. Army over 100 years ago. Sites throughout the Presidio provide spectacular views of the Pacific Ocean, the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin headlands, San Francisco Bay, and the skyline of San Francisco. It is adjacent to the largest marine sanctuary chain in the world.

The Presidio is unique in its historical, cultural, and natural reach. If you have not seen it, you should. It is a dramatic site that you will never forget.

H.R. 1296 protects these resources, through a Presidio Trust, while requiring cost-effective management of the Presidio. Vote for H.R. 1296.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1296, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT CONSENT ACT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 558) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 558

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDING.

The Congress finds that the compact set forth in section 5 is in furtherance of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021b et seq.).

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS OF CONSENT TO COMPACT.

The consent of the Congress to the compact set forth in section 5—

(1) shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) is granted subject to the provisions of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021b et seq.); and

(3) is granted only for so long as the regional commission established in the compact complies with all of the provisions of such Act.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

The Congress may alter, amend, or repeal this Act with respect to the compact set forth in section 5 after the expiration of the 10-year period following the date of the enactment of this Act, and at such intervals thereafter as may be provided in such compact.

SEC. 5. TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT.

In accordance with section 4(a)(2) of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021d(a)(2)), the consent of the Congress is given to the States of Texas, Maine, and Vermont to enter into the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact. Such compact is substantially as follows:

"TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT

"ARTICLE I. POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 1.01. The party states recognize a responsibility for each state to seek to manage low-level radioactive waste generated within its boundaries, pursuant to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, as amended by the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 2021b-2021j). They also recognize that the United States Congress, by enacting the Act, has authorized and encouraged states to enter